

Preparing Moral Eductors in an Era of Standards-Based Reform

By Robert W. Howard

Introduction: Moral Education is Essential

Debate over the aims of public education never ends. However, preparing a new generation of citizens is one of the aims for which there is a broad consensus (e.g., Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, 2003; Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley, & Goodlad, 2004; Ravitch & Viteritti 2001). Citizenship has both political and social dimensions, and each inherently involves ethical issues. It is neither possible nor desirable to leave moral issues outside the realm of schooling. Consequently, moral education must be one of two generic aims of education; the other is teaching academic content and skills.

The current standards-based environment, embodied at the federal level in the United States by the No Child Left Behind legislation of 2001, typically treats teaching content and skills as paramount. This frequently has the effect of diminishing the status of moral education. However, success in teaching content and skills while slighting moral education can produce unacceptable results. Consider Theodore Kaczynski, the “Unabomber.” Shortly after Kaczynski’s arrest, Frank Rich (1996),

Robert W. Howard is an assistant professor in the Education Program at the University of Washington, Tacoma, Tacoma, Washington.

Preparing Moral Educators

in his *New York Times* column, asked whether Harvard University should, in its recruiting materials and elsewhere, claim the Unabomber as an educational success story—a distinguished alumnus. After humorously debating both sides of the question, Rich concluded, with irony, that Harvard should claim Kaczynski as a success because, “After all, who but a Harvard man [sic] could outwit the Feds for eighteen years?” (Rich, 1996).

The Unabomber’s abilities went beyond avoiding capture. Kaczynski was a prodigy in mathematics. He enrolled early in Harvard, earned a doctorate in mathematics at the University of Michigan, and taught at the University of California at Berkeley. While Kaczynski’s prose was turgid, his Manifesto would probably pass the high school standards for current high stakes tests throughout the nation. Kaczynski knew chemistry (obviously). Finally, the Unabomber demonstrated skills often associated with vocational education in the construction of the explosives and the boxes that carried them (e.g., Chase, 2003). If judged by acquisition of skills and academic content alone, Kaczynski constitutes an educational success story; if judged by moral standards, he was a failure.

Definition

Moral education helps students to recognize and respond to ethical issues. The question of whether morality or character can be taught was posed to Socrates in *The Meno*. Socrates expressed some skepticism about the endeavor, but through his dialogues, he engaged in moral education. Today, advocates of three major approaches to moral education argue that moral education is both possible and inevitable: that is, an educator cannot avoid moral education. Ryan and Bohlin conclude that moral education “simply comes with the territory.... Children cannot enter the educational system at age four and stay until age sixteen or seventeen without having their character and their moral values profoundly affected by the experience (1999, p. 22).” Moral education may appear in a deliberately-planned way through a specific curriculum or program (e.g., Child Development Project, 1996), or it may be integrated into academic disciplines (e.g., Simon, 2001). Even if a school has not implemented a specific program or consciously integrated ethical issues into existing curricula, the school still engages in moral education through its *hidden curriculum*. This hidden curriculum includes the quality of the interactions and relationships, classroom management, and methods of school governance (e.g., Dewey, 1975; Sergiovanni, 1992, 1994; Sizer & Sizer, 1999).

Many educational theorists agree that moral education in schooling prepares the next generation of democratic citizens (e.g., Banks, 1997; Dewey, 1966, 1975). However, the consensus does not extend to the content of such lessons or the strategies needed to teach them. Thus, “what?” and “how?” become central questions for K-12 teachers and the institutions of higher education that prepare them.

Robert W. Howard

An Introduction to the Three Major Approaches to Moral Education

Three major approaches to moral education dominate the field: *character*, *cognitive developmental*, and *caring*. While overly reductionistic, it can be useful in introducing them to describe the basic nature of each of the approaches with a single summative phrase.

Character education's history has Aristotelian roots and the pedagogical implications are to create or "engrave on our essence" much like carving a character into a piece of wood. "To do the good is to know the good" is an overly simplistic summary. In line with its Aristotelian tradition, the character approach focuses on action and emphasizes making virtuous behaviors habitual (e.g., DeRoche & Williams, 1998; Ryan & Bohlin, 1999).

The cognitive developmental tradition (abbreviated as *developmental* hereafter), in contrast, draws more on Socrates than Aristotle. Its focus is on the process of ethical decision-making over the content-driven character education. The developmental tradition emphasizes reason over action because it is assumed that right reason leads to right action—that is, "to know the right is to do the right." The developmental approach frequently has justice as its preeminent concern in morality and moral development (e.g., Kohlberg, 1981).

In contrast to the developmentalists' focus on justice, relationships are at the core of the caring approach (e.g., Gilligan, 1977, 1982; Noddings, 1984, 1992, 2002). The foundation for this approach is the *ethic of care*. Noddings's provides a brief summary, "Ethical caring is always aimed at establishing, restoring, or enhancing the kind of relation in which we respond freely [to others] because we want to do so" (2002, p. 14). Detailed descriptions of the approaches appear below in a subsequent section.

Terminology

A note on language: terminology has changed frequently for what is called here *moral education*. Two decades ago, moral education was the generic term for the examination of ethical issues in classrooms and schools. Subsequently, *values education* became more common. Today, *character education* is the most widely used descriptor. However, since *character* also refers to one of the three major approaches in moral education and can be confusing. *Moral education* is the phrase still preferred by advocates of the other two approaches. For clarity, this paper will use *moral education* to refer to the entire field and *character education* to refer to the one approach.

History

Moral education has a long history in schooling in the United States (e.g., McClellan, 1999). In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it was seen as the primary purpose of education. Within public schooling, support for moral education waxes and wanes. These changes are frequently related to historical events and

Preparing Moral Educators

political movements (e.g., Howard, Berkowitz, & Schaeffer, 2004). In the 1960s and 1970s, a period of great cultural transitions, the conventional educational wisdom was to leave questions of values outside the classroom. Brief periods of renewed interest in moral education followed the Watergate scandal that ended in the resignation of Richard Nixon in 1974 and more recently after the tragic shootings at Columbine High School in 1999. In both cases, schools reflected society's pondering ethical failures and saw moral education as a potential way to avoid recurrences. The post-tragedy spotlight on moral education is typically short-lived and other agendas regain dominant status.

The contemporary standards-based environment (e.g., Peterson & West, 2004) makes conducting quality moral education a challenge in both K-12 classrooms and teacher preparation programs. The primary elements of the standards movement that create the difficulties for moral education are the emphasis on narrow curricular content and "high-stakes assessments," which are at the core of standards-based reform (e.g., Meier, 2002, 2003). These high-stakes assessments typically: (a) test a narrow range of content, (b) provide a single-opportunity for the student to demonstrate learning, (c) are conducted only in English, and (d) make few accommodations for students with special needs. All of these elements raise ethical issues. Whether standards-based education can be defended from charges that the process and consequences are not fair is a significant issue, but beyond the scope of this paper. To a narrower question, "Is moral education compatible with standards-based education?" this paper makes an argument in the affirmative.

Compatibility of Standards and Moral Education

Not all standards approaches are equivalent. Some approaches are valuable—if one separates the ethically questionable aspects of *standards-based education* as a movement and considers *standards* alone. Two of these praiseworthy standards are those developed by Newmann, Secada, and Wehlage (1995) and the Powerful and Authentic Social Studies (PASS) standards published by the National Council for the Social Studies (1999-2000).

Many conceptions of standards consist only of stringent criteria for (a) academic curriculum and (b) student performance on tests of their learning. The Newmann, et al. and the PASS approaches include and go beyond curriculum and performance to include (a) standards for high quality instruction or teaching and (b) what constitutes good tasks for testing student learning (Newmann, et al., 1995, pp. 86-93).

To illustrate how moral education can be included in standards-based education, consider the ethical implications of new technology as outlined in this excerpt of a *Boston Globe* article:

Using magnetic resonance imaging machines that detect the ebb and flow of brain activity, researchers have become so good at peering into the workings of the human mind that their work is raising a new and deeply personal ethical concern: brain privacy.

One study of white students found that although they expressed no conscious

Robert W. Howard

racism, the seat of fear in their brains still fired up more when they looked at unfamiliar black faces than at unfamiliar white faces. Another recent imaging study reported that certain parts of the brain work harder when a person is lying than when telling the truth, raising the prospect of a brain-based lie detector. (Goldberg, 2003)

This dilemma of pitting technological advances against personal privacy could be the catalyst for a well-conducted science or social studies classroom discussion about the ethical dimensions and policy implications of the new technology. It would score high on several of the elements of the PASS standards for quality instruction. These elements are ethical valuing, higher order thinking, deep knowledge, substantive conversation, and connections to the world beyond the classroom (National Council for the Social Studies, 1999-2000).

This dilemma, created by changes in technology, could also be used to structure an assessment of a student's learning. A student could be given the task to develop and share with state legislators a policy brief outlining the issue and options for "brain-based lie detectors." The format used by the Kettering Foundation's National Issues Forum (e.g., Doble & Associates, 2003) could serve as a model. The policy brief can serve as evidence of what the student has learned. This policy-brief task would force students to deal with a real-world problem and to write for an audience beyond the walls of the classroom and school. To successfully complete the task, students must organize information and consider alternative approaches. The document would also demonstrate knowledge of disciplinary content and processes (Newman, et al., pp. 81-85). While it should not need to justify its place in classrooms and schools in this way, moral education can be compatible with standards-based instruction and assessment.

Moral education's compatibility with standards-based assessment is not limited to those advocated by the National Council for the Social Studies in PASS. The knowledge and skills taught in moral education can prepare students for high-stakes tests as well. For example, in Washington State the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL), the high-stakes test students in the class of 2006 must pass before high school graduation, includes a test of students' writing. The WASL requires students to write a persuasive essay. To pass the test, the students' compositions must take a specific position on an issue and argue for that position offering support by multiple reasons and evidence. In 2004, the WASL gave students this prompt:

Your principal is considering inviting a singer or musical group to perform for students at your school to raise money for a local charity. If you could invite anyone, whom would you choose? In a multiple-paragraph letter, persuade your principal to invite the singer or group of your choice. (Pearson Educational Measurement Scoring Directors, Niemi, Carr, Stein, & Howell, 2004, p. iv)

Most moral educators would prefer that the writing prompt direct students to make a persuasive case for which charity or charities should benefit from the performance.

Preparing Moral Educators

This would focus the response on issues of social and distributive justice. By its nature, moral education requires students to consider competing ethical positions and to evaluate how well reasoned, supported, and convincing is each position. This ability can be applied to ethical issues and non-moral or pragmatic issues. Often the relevant reasons and evidence for ethical positions are scientific; sometimes the position is based on appeals to moral principles. In the WASL example above, a student might choose to focus on ethical issues. The student might advocate for Performers X based a utilitarian-ethical argument that the student believes X would (a) create the greatest pleasure for the greatest number of community members and/or (b) generate the greatest financial benefit for the community. A student could also use a virtue-based argument advocating that the school choose Performer Y because, in her lyrics and life, she demonstrates commendable ethical character. Of course, a student might use these skills developed through moral education to present an argument for Performer Z on personal taste or aesthetics alone, without reference to any ethical issues. In any construction, students can benefit from the critical thinking skills that are part of moral education.

The Need: Absence of Ethical Discourse in K-12 Classrooms

Although moral education should be part of schooling, discussions of ethical issues are largely absent in K-12 classrooms. Research by Nucci (2001) found that between third grade and fifth, the amount of discourse between students and teachers about ethical issues gradually declines. The trend continues and “by grade seven it is so infrequent that researchers could not employ a statistical analysis” (p. 18). In terms of interventions, adults are more likely to intervene in issues in the conventional domain: manners, politeness, rules of the house, and cultural norms. Issues in the conventional domain may have ethical dimensions, but are characterized as being defined by a given group of people and binding only on that group of people (e.g., what is considered polite can and does differ from group to group). Simon (2001) reported a similar finding based on observational research in classrooms and schools:

Fewer than 2% of classrooms . . . included discussions of moral or existential issues which were sustained for more than five minutes, which included more than a few students, or in which students had opportunities to speak more than a few words at a time. (p. 54)

Leming (2000) offers one potential explanation of the absence of ethical discourse: moral education programs are not always seen as a priority by educators and are often sacrificed because of pressure on educators to be “accountable” as measured by standardized test results.

The research of Leming, Nucci, and Simon that documents the lack of moral discourse in classrooms is disquieting for moral educators who see ethics as both fundamental to education and as a means to promote critical thinking. Ethical

Robert W. Howard

discourse should not be *terra incognita* for either students or adults; and while it may be more difficult to measure these habits of mind, moral education is compatible with academic achievement: good moral education promotes intellectual growth.

The Need: Absence of Moral Education in Teacher Education Programs

While most teacher education programs have a theoretical commitment to moral education, in the programs' pedagogy and practice moral education is lacking. In the last major survey of moral education in teacher preparation, Jones, Ryan, and Bohlin (1998) surveyed deans of teacher education programs and found that 90% of the deans agreed with a statement that moral education belongs in classrooms and schools. However, 81% had difficulty including moral education in their curriculum, and only 24% reported that it was emphasized in their program. A mere 13% were satisfied with the place moral education had in their teacher preparation program. The deans addressed the gap between what is desirable in their programs and what exists in this way:

Prominent among [the deans'] reasons [for the absence] were the limited time and space in their teacher education curricula. They reported that they were so busy meeting their states' mandated content requirements that they had no opportunity to add new content." (Ryan & Bohlin, 2000, p. 41)

Since this survey, published in 1998, documenting moral education in teacher preparation programs, the pressure of standards-based reform has increased in several ways, the most notable being the passage in 2000 of the federal No Child Left Behind legislation. It is reasonable to predict that, if conducted today, the data would quantify a further decline in the status of moral education.

**Preparing the Next Generation of Moral Education:
Prescriptions for Teacher Preparation**

Teacher education programs should, in my view, put into practice what the deans value in theory. What are the implications of moral education for teacher education programs? In spite of the many differences, the three approaches are in consensus on four major points that have a direct impact on teacher preparation. First, moral issues arise naturally in school settings and should be made explicit and become the focus of critical inquiry. Second, teacher preparation programs should prepare the next generation of moral educators by including ethics as part of the curriculum. Third, discussion of ethical issues is possible in all academic disciplines; teachers should have the requisite skills to conduct the dialogues and deliberations. Finally, academic service-learning can be a powerful strategy for moral education; future teachers should learn this strategy in their preparation programs.

Preparing Moral Educators

Teaching Ethical Decision Making in Teacher Preparation Program

To be a moral educator, one needs, at minimum, an awareness of ethical issues and the courage to address them. To accomplish this, I believe that teacher preparation programs should include an examination of ethical decision-making. Kidder (1995) and Shapiro (1999) each offer easily accessible introductions to ethical theory for students without much background in moral philosophy. Beyond this basic introduction, the students should be introduced to the major approaches to moral education with an emphasis of consensus among the three.

The Foundations of the Three Approaches to Moral Education – Psychology and Pedagogy

The three major approaches to moral education—character, cognitive developmental, and caring—were introduced in a previous section of this paper. Here, the psychological foundations and educational prescriptions of the approaches will be described and compared.

The Character Approach.

Character, as defined by Ryan and Bohlin, consists of “knowing the good,” “loving the good,” and “doing the good” (1999, p. 5). In character education, the good is frequently summarized by a list of traits or virtues. The challenge for the community that has defined a set of desirable traits is to transmit to the next generation moral content, definitions, and the habit to engage in virtuous action. Ryan and Bohlin describe the process by which individuals create their character as parallel to the task of engraver, but instead of engraving on an object, here the task is to engrave a community’s determined set of character virtues on one’s self.

A tension may exist in character education between the virtues one chooses for oneself and those deemed desirable by the community. This tension—what in Piagetian terms would be characterized as “seeking an autonomous moral self via heteronomous means”—is well summarized by Peters’s (1966) classic description of the “paradox” of moral education: “The palace of reason has to be entered by the courtyard of habit” (p. 314). Whether those habits are self-chosen or imposed is a matter of interpretation, but in the view of character educators, the habits are what constitute moral education.

The Developmental Approach.

Developmentalists believe that knowledge and skills result from an individual’s interaction with physical and social environments. This is true of ethics as well as knowledge of scientific facts, for example. Rather than the engraving metaphor of the character approach, developmentalists are more likely to use the metaphor of a philosopher (Kohlberg, 1981) to describe human growth. Humans, particularly children, are always in the process of constructing meaning. This is true, for example, in understanding how we make sense of bits of light in the night sky (i.e.,

Robert W. Howard

epistemology) and come to recognize and address the ethical dimensions of copyright and intellectual property in an era of digital technology (i.e., moral philosophy). Following in the tradition of Kant (1981), the American Pragmatists (e.g., Dewey, 1966, 1975), and Piaget (1997), developmentalists acknowledge the importance of achievement in all types of knowledge, but they emphasize the need for individuals to come to know those achievements by their active experience. This is in contrast to a passive notion (what Freire [1993] calls the “banking” method with knowledge being “deposited” in young minds). Kohlberg’s (1984) stage theory is the most widely known psychological and pedagogical foundation cited by developmentalists. According to this theory, growth occurs in stages and each is characterized by increasing moral capacities. Individuals move from stage to stage when they encounter the limitations of their current stage. The resulting disequilibrium is the catalyst to construct a more comprehensive understanding of ethical issues. In terms of education, pedagogical strategies should support a student’s current stage of development (e.g., providing opportunities to generalize current abilities to new contexts) and challenge current abilities to create a stimulus for growth to the next stage. This approach was ubiquitous in the 1970s and 1980s. Current developmentalists rely less on a fixed concept of stages in psychological development (e.g., Gibbs, 2003; Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999) and do not emphasize to the same extent the use of hypothetical dilemmas, which characterized Kohlberg’s early moral education efforts (e.g., Reed, 1997).

Nucci (2001) provides such a contemporary account of developmental approach to moral education and describes the type of strategies deemed developmentally appropriate at different ages. In early childhood, the focus is “framing” the student’s moral experiences and guiding the child in conflict resolution strategies (Nucci, 2001). In middle childhood (corresponding to elementary school grades 3-6), the developmental prescription is to emphasize the concrete, fair distribution of resources and the appropriate distribution of praise among students. At this point in a child’s moral maturation, introducing peer mediation as an approach to conflict resolution can provide successful method of classroom management. Simultaneously, the experience of addressing conflicts and resolving them among peers (with less reliance on the teacher as primary disciplinarian) can serve as a catalyst for students’ further development. In adolescence (Grades 7-12) the focus shifts to creating classrooms and school structures that are fair (Nucci, 2001, p. 158). This change reflects a diminished role of the teacher and an increased role of the system. It is at this developmental stage that Nucci advocates the use of democratic education such as Just Community Schools (Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989; Reed, 1997) or the “School-within-a-School” (SWS) model from Brookline (MA) High School (Mosher, Kenny, & Garrod, 1994). In Just Community schools and SWS, rules and norms are created and enforced through direct democracy. To allow direct democracy, the Just Community Schools needed to be relatively small, or in some current terminology, “personalized” (e.g., Murphy, Beck, Crawford, Hodges, & McGaughy, 2001).

The Caring Approach.

Carol Gilligan and Nel Noddings, in my judgment, best articulate the caring approach from psychological and philosophical perspectives, respectively. Gilligan's journal article (1977) and subsequent book with the same title (1982), *In a Different Voice*, were major catalysts for research and theory on caring as a foundation for education about ethical issues. In her early writings, Gilligan and her colleagues posited a developmental model (Gilligan, 1977, 1982; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988), but subsequently abandoned the line of research.

Noddings (2002) describes four components of the caring approach: (a) modeling, (b) dialogue, (c) practice, and (d) confirmation (p. 16). Noddings explains the need for modeling: "In the care perspective, we have to show in our modeling what it means to care." Dialogue is the "most fundamental component of the care model" (p.16). The purpose of dialogue in moral education is "to establish and maintain caring relations at both individual and societal levels" (p.16). Practice is necessary because "To develop the capacity to care, one must engage in caregiving activities" (p. 19). The fourth element, confirmation, requires that when individuals are confronted by another's objectionable decision or action, the offended give the other credit for having the best possible motives—consonant with reality rather than attributing lesser or the worst intentions.

The caring approach to morality differs from the character and developmental approaches in significant ways: (a) a morality of care is relational rather than individual; (b) it gives primacy to moral emotions and sentiments, claiming these to be the stimulus to moral action and moral reasoning (not always in that order); and (c) care does not require that moral decisions need to be "universalized" to be justified. The concept of universalizability has a long tradition in philosophy. This tradition defines the moral as involving (a) prescriptive judgments (e.g., Chris ought to do X) and (b) universalizing those judgments to others in the same or substantially similar situations (Pat is right to do X—and not Y—in the same situation that Chris faced). Care emphasizes the particular rather than the universal (e.g., it is right for Pat to do X and for Chris to do Y in similar situations).

Caring also includes in its approach to moral education a (secular) concept of evil as "creating pain, separation, and helplessness" (Noddings, 1989, p.120). From the caring perspective there is a struggle between the good and the bad: caring and evil. Caring, the good, is to be nurtured and promoted. Evil is to be recognized, avoided, and eliminated. Evil falls into three categories: "natural, cultural, and moral": The pain of illness and death are natural evils; poverty, war, and sexism are cultural evils; the deliberate infliction of physical or psychic pain—unless we can show convincingly that it is necessary for a desirable state in the one undergoing the pain—is a moral evil (Noddings, 1989, pp. 120-121).

The ethic of care emphasizes emotions in moral education because, according to Noddings, they provide a starting point for recognizing and responding to good and evil (2002, pp. 114-117). To illustrate the latter, Noddings (2002) writes:

Robert W. Howard

Faced with evil, we must feel revulsion. Faced with another's pain, we must feel the desire to remove or alleviate it. Faced with our own inclinations to cause harm, we must be both shocked and willing to face the reality. *Then we can invite reason to service our corrected passions* [emphasis added]. (p. 8)

Gilligan (1977, 1982) argued that the ethic of care is more prevalent in and better articulated by women than men. Noddings subtitled her first book on the topic: "a feminine approach to ethics and moral education." Gender issues are often central to (frequently heated) discussions and research in publications in both academic and popular literature (e.g., Hoff-Sommers, 2000; Newberger, 2000; Pipher, 1994; Pollock, 2001). It is also important to note that while undeniably influential, Gilligan's theory and research has not generated consensus among feminist scholars for either its philosophical claims or empirical data (e.g., Card, 1996, Walker, 1998).

Discussion of Ethical Issues in the Classroom

Earlier in the paper, a technology dilemma in science and/or social studies classes was used to illustrate the compatibility of moral education with high-quality instruction and assessment. Discussion of ethical issues is possible in all academic disciplines. Literature provides another example of how moral education can be integrated into academic curricula. In using the Old Testament as literature, teachers might select the story of the two women who claim motherhood of the same infant and King Solomon's obligation to make a decision. All three approaches to moral education advocate such discourse in the classroom, but they do differ in how the discussions get framed. The caring perspective will examine the nature and quality of the relationships of those involved. Developmentalists will focus first on the clash of claims and seek to use a principle that can be used to resolve the dilemma. Character educators will ask which virtues are relevant in an attempt to find one that applies in the context.

Moral discussions are not limited to the humanities and science. Using mathematical knowledge to address the fairness of differential insurance rates based on age and gender also integrates moral education into the curriculum. Examples in sports and physical education include the fairness of judging in Olympic figure skating (e.g., Begley, 2002) or whether Pete Rose's admitted gambling should disqualify him for Baseball's Hall of Fame (e.g., Kidder, 2004). In the arts, whether museums have an ethical obligation to return works of art stolen, for example, by the Nazi regime in World War II (e.g., Blumenthal, 2003) is one opportunity for moral education. Another art-related opportunity for ethical discussion is to examine the content of a painting. For example, was it ethical for Karl Bodmer to paint a Buffalo Dance of the Mandan Indians (e.g., Bruce, 1990), given that the Mandan considered it ceremony sacred ceremony? For both professors in teacher preparation and for teachers in K-12 classrooms, several good resources are available: Simon (2001) has many valuable recommendations for leading moral

Preparing Moral Educators

discussions. At the elementary level, Lickona (2004) and Watson (2003) outline opportunities for integrating discussions of ethical issues into both the curricula and classroom management. For older students, Hess (2002) and Parker (2003) offer recommendations for classroom discussion of controversial issues. Among the more programmatic approaches available are the Great Books Foundation (1992, 1998), the National Issues Forum (e.g., Doble & Associates, 2003; Mathews & McAfee, 2003), and Socratic Seminars (e.g., Moeller & Moeller, 2003).

Academic Service-Learning as a Strategy for Moral Education

Academic service-learning is another teaching strategy with great potential for moral education. In service-learning, students learn academic content by providing community service. One example of service-learning is providing a résumé service to unemployed homeless. While providing a service, the students simultaneously learn writing and vocational skills. In many service-learning experiences students confront ethical issues directly, for example, what responsibilities individuals and government have toward the homeless, the poor, or the abused. At other times students develop skills important in ethical reasoning and action, such as their ability to take the perspective of others or developing better conflict-resolution techniques. As is the case with classroom discussions of ethical issues, all three moral education approaches embrace service-learning as a strategy and it can be used across disciplines.

Illustrating the opportunities for moral education through service learning, Wade (2000) presents examples at elementary, middle, and high school levels: (a) a book drive for Navajo students, (b) a project working with issues of poverty and homelessness at the middle school level, and (c) at the high school level addressing community needs in collaboration with local government agencies. In the book drive, students at an elementary school in Oakland, CA learned about different communities and current needs of members of those communities, gained an appreciation of Navajo culture, and considered the history and ethics of how and why First Nation peoples were relocated to reservations. At the middle school level, The Open Shelter, in Columbus, OH, afforded students (many of whom in this example came from upper-middle class backgrounds) to take the perspective of men they met at a shelter for the homeless. Students also examined why the homeless shelter sits in a low-income urban community rather than a suburb and analyzed policy issues of distributive justice.

Two high schools in Virginia sent students in teams of three to work on projects that provided students with an understanding of local government and addressed important issues such as: (a) introducing a local income tax; (b) public drunkenness, which policy option has the best cost-benefit ratio?; (c) the possibility and potential benefits of curbside trash pickup over the existing transfer station; (d) the state of housing for low-income residents; (e) a program evaluation of a health department's immunization program; and (f) the local impact of the National Voter Registration on registration and ballots cast.

Robert W. Howard

The presence of service-learning in teacher education programs has grown (Anderson, Swick, & Yff, 2001), and many good resources are available for faculty in teacher preparation programs (e.g., Boyle-Baise, 2002; Callahan & Root, 2002; Wade, 1997).

Summary

To summarize the arguments in this paper, schools have a responsibility to prepare good citizens. This entails teaching moral education along with transmitting academic knowledge and skills. Moral education should be an explicit aim for every educator. Yet, ethical discourse is largely absent in K-12 classrooms and moral education has a small role in teacher education programs in the United States. To prepare the next generation of teachers, moral education should have a prominent place in teacher education. To accomplish this, the three major approaches to moral education—character, developmental, and caring—should be taught to teacher education students. The same is true of the strategies of (a) leading moral discussions in the classrooms and (b) using academic service learning.

This is a call for moral education. No guarantee of success exists that teachers alone can prevent a Unabomber, a president who violates the Constitution, a high school massacre, or torturing prisoners-of-war. However, promoting ethical behavior and avoiding evil should be among our goals. Our definitions of an educated person and of success in teaching must include more than teaching a student enough content and skills to score well on high stakes tests. Our definitions must also include preparing students to become full and responsible citizens who recognize and respond appropriately when facing ethical issues and dilemmas.

References

Anderson, J. B., Swick, K. J., & Yff, J. (Eds.) (2001). *Service-learning in teacher education: Enhancing the growth of new teachers, their students, and communities*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Banks, J. A. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Begley, S. (2002, February 25). Our sport has gangrene. *Newsweek*. Retrieved on February 28, 2002 from: <http://www.msnbc.com/news/709438.asp>

Billig, S. H., & Waterman, A. S. (2002). *Studying service-learning Innovations in education research methodology*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Blumenthal, R. (2003, January 29). Chicago Museum Cancels Show About Art Looting by the Nazis. *New York Times*. Retrieved on January 29, 2003 from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/01/29/national/29LOOT.html>

Boyle-Baise, M. (2002). *Multicultural service learning: Educating teachers in diverse communities*. New York. Teachers College Press.

Bruce, C. (Ed.) (1990). *Myth of the west*. New York: Rizzoli.

Callahan, J., & Root, S. (2002). The diffusion of academic service-learning in teacher education:

Preparing Moral Educators

A case study approach. In Eyler, J., & Billig, S. H. (2002). *Deconstructing service-learning: Research exploring context, participation, and impacts*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Card, C. (1996). *The unnatural lottery*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (2003). *The civic mission of schools*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York and Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

Chase, A. (2003). *Harvard and the Unabomber: The education of an American terrorist*. New York: Norton.

Child Development Project (1996). *Ways we want our class to be: Class meetings that build commitment to kindness and learning*. Oakland, CA: Developmental Studies Center.

DeRoche, E. F., & Williams, M. M. (1998). *Educating hearts and minds: A comprehensive character education framework*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Dewey, J. (1975). *Moral principles in education*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1909)

Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education*. New York: Free Press. (Original work published 1916)

Doble & Associates. (2003). *Terrorism: What should we do now?* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: New revised 20th-anniversary edition*. New York: Continuum.

Gibbs, J. C. (2003). *Moral development and reality: Beyond the theories of Kohlberg and Hoffman*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gilligan, C. F. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of the self and morality. *Harvard Educational Review* 47(4): 481-517.

Gilligan, C. F. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goldberg, C. (2003, May 1). Some fear loss of privacy as science pries into brain. *Boston Globe*, A1.

Goodlad, J. I., Mantle-Bromley, C., & Goodlad, S. J. (2004). *Education for everyone: Agenda for education in democracy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Great Books Foundation (1992). *An introduction to shared inquiry*. Chicago: Great Books Foundation.

Great Books Foundation (1998). *Politics, leadership, and justice*. Chicago: Great Books Foundation.

Hess, D. (2002). Discussing controversial issues in secondary social studies classes: Learning from skilled teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30, 10-41.

Hoff-Sommers, C. (2000). *The war against boys*. New York: Touchstone.

Howard, R. W., Berkowitz, M. W., & Schaeffer, E. (2004). Politics of character education. *Educational Policy*, 18(1) 188-215.

Jones, E. M., Ryan, K., & Bohlin, K. (1998). Character education and teacher education: How are prospective teachers being prepared to foster good character in students? *Action in Teacher Education*, 20 (4), 11-28.

Kant, I. (1981). *Grounding for the metaphysics of morals*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett. (First published in 1785)

Robert W. Howard

Kidder, R. (1995). *How good people make tough choices*. New York: Morrow.

Kidder, R. (2004, January 12). When moral courage fails: Pete Rose and the Boys Choir of Harlem. *Newslines*, 7(2). Camden, ME: Institute of Global Ethics.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development, vol. I. The philosophy of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on moral development, vol. II. The psychology of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Leming, J. S. (2000). *Current Evidence Regarding Program Effectiveness in Character Education: A Brief Review*. Unpublished manuscript.

Lickona, T. (2004). *Character matters: How to help our children to develop good judgment, integrity, and other essential virtues*. New York: Touchstone.

Mathews, D., & McAfee, N. (2003, October). *Making choices together: The power of public deliberation*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.

McClellan, B. E. (1999). *Moral education in America: Schools and the shaping of character from colonial times to the present*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Meier, D. (2002). *In schools we trust: Creating communities of learning in an era of testing and standardization*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Meier, D. (Ed.) (2002). *Will standards save public education?* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Moeller, M. V., & Moeller, V. (2003). *Socratic seminars and literature circles for middle and high schools*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Mosher, R., Kenny, R. A., & Garrod, A. C. (1994). *Preparing for citizenship: Teaching youth to live democratically*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Murphy, J., Beck, L. G., Crawford, M. Hodges, A., & McGaughy, C. L. (2001). *The productive high school: Creating personalized academic communities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1999-2000). *Powerful and authentic social studies (PASS): A professional development program for teachers*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies; Oakland County, MI: Oakland Schools.

Newberger, E. (2000). *The men they will become: The nature and nurture of male character*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Newmann, F. M., Secada, W. G., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). *A guide to authentic instruction and assessment: Vision, standards and scoring*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nucci, L. (2001). *Education in the moral domain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pearson Educational Measurement Scoring Directors, Niemi, B., Carr, C., Stein, H., & Howell, L. (2004). Grade 7 Anchor Set Annotations from the Spring 2004 Washington Assessment of Student Learning in Writing (Document number 04-0036). Olympia, WA: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Preparing Moral Educators

Peters, R. S. (1966). *Ethics and education*. London, UK: George Allen and Unwin.

Peterson, P. E., & West, R. W. (Eds.) (2004). *No child left behind? The politics and practice of school accountability*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Piaget, J. (1997). *The moral judgement of the child*. New York: Free Press. (Original work published 1932)

Pipher, M. (1994). *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the selves of adolescent girls*. New York: Ballantine.

Pollack, W. S. (2001). *Real Boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood*. New York: Ballantine.

Power, F. C., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). *Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ravitch, D., & Viteritti, J.P. (Eds.) (2001). *Making good citizens: Education and civil society*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Reeves, D. B. (2002). *The leader's guide to standards: A blueprint for educational equity and excellence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reed, D. R. C. (1997). *Following Kohlberg: Liberalism and the practices of democratic community*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Rest, J.R., Narvaez, D., Bebeau M.J., & Thoma, S.J., (1999). Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rich, F. (1996, April 10). Grand Old Ivy. *New York Times*. Section A; Page 19.

Ryan K., & Bohlin, K. (1999). *Building character in schools: practical ways to bring moral instruction to life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ryan K. & Bohlin, K. (2000, March 8). Teacher education's empty suit. *Education Week*, 19 (26) 41-42.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shapiro, D. (1999). *Choosing the right thing to do: In life, at work, in relationship, and for the planet*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Simon, K. (2001). *Moral questions in the classroom: How to get kids to think deeply about real life and their schoolwork*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sizer, T. R. & Sizer, N. F. (1999). *The students are watching: Schools and the moral contract*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Wade, R. C. (Ed.) (1997). *Community service-learning: A guide to including service in the public school curriculum*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Wade, R. C. (Ed.) (2000). *Building bridges: Connecting classroom and community through service-learning in social studies*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Walker, M. U. (1998). *Moral understandings: A feminist study in ethics*. New York: Routledge.

Watson, M. (2003). *Learning to trust: Transforming difficult elementary classrooms through developmental discipline*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.